Academic Health Science Networks - stakeholder research 2016
Overview
Survey details

This online survey was administered to stakeholders of the Academic Health Science Networks and covers the same areas as the first wave in 2015.

As with last year, stakeholders were initially pre-identified and provided with the opportunity to comment on any of the following:

- The AHSN which they are identified as having worked with/are associated with;
- Any other AHSN; and
- The entire AHSN network at a national level.

In addition, individuals who were not pre-identified as stakeholders were also given the chance to comment on AHSNs of their choosing via open links disseminated by NHS England, other stakeholders, and through AHSNs’ own communication channels.

This report contains responses specifically given in relation to Health Innovation Network South London. This is based on 69 responses. In the report, the data is compared against the 2015 results for this AHSN, and also the total figure for all AHSNs for each specific question.

The survey ran between 17th August and 19th September 2016.
### Who took part?

#### Stakeholder type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Type</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) (n=6)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Institute (n=7)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Economic Partnership (LEP) (n=1)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government (n=3)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients group (n=5)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private company (n=9)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health or social care provider (n=17)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) (n=7)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (n=14)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Working relationship

- We see ourselves as a member /partner of the AHSN (9%)
- We have worked with the AHSN in the last 12 months (58%)
- Neither of the above (51%)

Note: All AHSN figures in brackets

### Answering on behalf of their organisation or as an individual

- The organisation (33%)
- As an individual (67%)

Note: All AHSN figures in brackets

### Sample source

- Non pre-identified stakeholders (Open Link) (31%)
- Pre-identified stakeholder (Targeted list) (65%)

Note: All AHSN figures in brackets

---

S1. Which of the following best describes your organisation?
S2. Which, if any, of the following applies to your organisation....?
S3. Is this response on behalf of your entire organisation or you as an individual?
Understanding the results

A sample of stakeholders were surveyed, rather than the entire population of stakeholders. The percentage results are subject to sampling tolerances – which vary depending on the size of the sample and the percentage concerned.

Confidence levels say how ‘sure’ we are about the results. That is, at 95% confidence level we have 95% probability that the results didn’t happen by chance but are similar to what is real for the population. If the survey was rerun 100 times the results in 95 of those surveys would fall very closely to the first run.

For example, for a question where 50% of the stakeholders in a sample of 100 respond with a particular answer, the chances are 95 in 100 that this result would not vary more than one percentage point, plus or minus, from the result that would have been obtained from a census of the entire population of stakeholders (using the sample procedure).

However, caution should be taken where the sample is smaller than 100. When comparing an individual AHSN’s results to the national average, a difference must be of at least a certain size to be statistically significant. The table below illustrates the percentage difference needed based on example size sizes and percentage, in order to be at the 95% confidence level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of sample</th>
<th>Approximate sampling tolerances applicable to percentages at or near these levels (at the 95% confidence level)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>6% points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>7% points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>8% points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also please note that sometimes the adding together of two percentages will not equal the net calculation because of rounding.
Summary
Summary (1)

• 86% would recommend working with HIN South London (slide 42). This is a small decrease compared to 2015 (91%) but still places HIN South London in the upper tier against the AHSN average.

• Four out of five stakeholders (81%) felt that the AHSN had helped them achieve their objectives over the previous year (slide 40). This was considerably higher than in 2015 (66%) and is higher than average for all AHSNs (62%).

• Over half (54%) of stakeholders state that they have a ‘good’ understanding of HIN South London’s role (slide 10). This is an increase compared to 2015 (43%) and above average for all AHSNs (46%). Accordingly – a 67% feel that its role has become clearer in the last 12 months.

• Over a third (35%) state that they have a good understanding of HIN South London’s plans and priorities with another 38% having a fair understanding (slide 13). This is an improvement compared to 2015 when 32% had a ‘good’ understanding and compares favourably with the average for all AHSNs this year (26%).
Summary (2)

- 78% now feel that the AHSN has clear and visible leadership, compared to 61% in 2015 (slide 18). This figure is higher than the average across all AHSNs (68%).

- Over three quarters (78%) agree that HIN South London’s priorities are aligned to local priorities (slide 23). This is another improvement compared to 2015 (61%) and is higher than the level across all AHSNs (63%).

- 84% think HIN South London’s work has been valuable in terms of ‘facilitating collaboration’ over the past 12 months. This represents an increase of 12 percentage points compared to 2015. Furthermore, 74% have found value in its ‘quality improvement’ work and 77% in the ‘identification, adoption and spread of innovation’ (slide 29 & 30).

- Perceptions of the effectiveness of HIN South London have increased compared to 2015. 79% agreed it has been effective on ‘focusing on the needs of patients and local populations’ compared to 69% in 2015 and likewise 77% on ‘speeding up the adoption of innovation into practice’ compared to 63% last year (slide 36 & 37).
Understanding the role of the AHSN
Q. To what extent do you feel you understand the role of the AHSN?

- **A good understanding**
  - 2015: 43% (n=35)
  - 2016: 54% (n=69)

- **A fair understanding**
  - 2015: 40% (n=35)
  - 2016: 29% (n=69)

- **A little understanding**
  - 2015: 17% (n=35)
  - 2016: 10% (n=69)

- **None at all**
  - 2015: 7% (n=35)

2016 Average:
- 46% A good understanding
- 37%
- 14%
- 4%
Q. And thinking about the past 12 months, to what extent has the role of the AHSN become more or less clear?

Net: More clear = % much more clear + % more clear
Net: Less clear = % much less clear + % less clear

2015 (n=35)
- 27%
- 26%
- 9%

2016 (n=67)
- 6%
- 6%
- 9%

2016 Average
- 9%
- 30%
- 61%

Net: More clear
Net: Less clear
No change
Understanding of AHSN plans and priorities
Q. To what extent, if at all, do you understand the AHSN's plans and priorities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 (n=34)</th>
<th>2016 (n=66)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A good understanding</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fair understanding</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little understanding</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 Average:
- A good understanding: 26%
- A fair understanding: 42%
- A little understanding: 25%
- None at all: 7%
q. Which AHSN initiatives or programmes are you aware of?

- Diabetes Collaborative
- Dementia Workstream
- MSK
- digitalhealth.london
- Internship scheme
- No Catheter No CAUTI
- Escape Pain
Stakeholder relationship with the AHSN
Q. Overall, how would you rate your working relationship with your AHSN?

- **Very good**: 51% (2016), 38% (2015)
- **Quite good**: 26% (2016), 32% (2015)
- **Neither good nor poor**: 17% (2016), 18% (2015)
- **Quite poor**: 3% (2016), 6% (2015)
- **Very poor**: 3% (2016), 3% (2015)

2016 Average: 41%
Q. Thinking back over the past 12 months, would you say your working relationship with the AHSN has got better, worse, or is about the same?

- A lot better: 24% (2015), 31% (2016)
- A little better: 26% (2015), 28% (2016)
- About the same: 41% (2015), 38% (2016)
- A little worse: 6% (2015), 2% (2016)
- A lot worse: 3% (2015), 2% (2016)

2016 Average:
- A lot better: 28%
- A little better: 25%
- About the same: 41%
- A little worse: 4%
- A lot worse: 2%
Stakeholder perceptions
Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following?

*The AHSN has clear and visible leadership*

Net agree = % strongly agree + % tend to agree
Net disagree = % strongly disagree + % tend to disagree

2016 Average:
- **68%** Net agree
- **11%** Neither disagree nor agree
- **7%** Net disagree
- **15%** Don’t know

2016 (n=64):
- **78%** Net agree
- **14%** Neither disagree nor agree
- **3%** Net disagree
- **5%** Don’t know

2015 (n=33):
- **61%** Net agree
- **12%** Neither disagree nor agree
- **6%** Net disagree
- **14%** Don’t know

Net agree = % strongly agree + % tend to agree
Net disagree = % strongly disagree + % tend to disagree
Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following?

I have confidence in the AHSN to deliver its plans and priorities

Net agree = % strongly agree + % tend to agree
Net disagree = % strongly disagree + % tend to disagree

2016 Average
- Net agree: 77%
- Net disagree: 10%
- Neither disagree nor agree: 19%
- Don’t know: 7%

2015 (n=33)
- Net agree: 64%
- Net disagree: 24%
- Neither disagree nor agree: 6%
- Don’t know: 6%

2016 (n=64)
- Net agree: 64%
- Net disagree: 19%
- Neither disagree nor agree: 24%
- Don’t know: 2%
Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following?

**AHSN staff are knowledgeable**

![Survey Results Chart]

Net agree = % strongly agree + % tend to agree
Net disagree = % strongly disagree + % tend to disagree

2016 Average:
- Net agree: 78%
- Net disagree: 11%
- Neither disagree nor agree: 5%
- Don’t know: 6%

2015 (n=33):
- Net agree: 82%
- Net disagree: 12%
- Neither disagree nor agree: 6%
- Don’t know: 6%
Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following?

*AHSN staff are helpful*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016 (n=64)</th>
<th>2015 (n=33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net agree</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net disagree</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net agree = % strongly agree + % tend to agree
Net disagree = % strongly disagree + % tend to disagree

2016 Average:
- Net agree: 82%
- Net disagree: 9%
- Neither agree nor disagree: 4%
- Don’t know: 5%
Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following?

**AHSN priorities are aligned to local priorities**

Net agree = % strongly agree + % tend to agree

Net disagree = % strongly disagree + % tend to disagree

2016 Average

- Net agree: 63%
- Net disagree: 18%
- Neither disagree nor agree: 8%
- Don’t know: 11%

2015 (n=33)

- Net agree: 61%
- Net disagree: 12%
- Neither disagree nor agree: 6%
- Don’t know: 16%

2016 (n=64)

- Net agree: 78%
- Net disagree: 2%
- Neither disagree nor agree: 5%
- Don’t know: 2%
Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree that in the last 12 months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The AHSN has engaged with you effectively when developing its plans and priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 (n=60)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015 (n=32)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIN South London:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The AHSN has listened to your views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 (n=60)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015 (n=32)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIN South London:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>You have felt involved in the AHSN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 (n=60)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015 (n=32)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIN South London:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net agree = % strongly agree + % tend to agree
Attitudes towards AHSN staff
Q. If you have any comments about the AHSN’s staff, leadership and priorities, please type in below

Common words used to describe HIN South London staff are ‘helpful’ and ‘knowledgeable’...

“My contact with AHSN staff has given me the highest-possible regard for their vision and professionalism. Their desire to provide meaningful innovation is combined with excellent management skills - wonderfully helpful and reassuring to a small organisation like ours.”
Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS)

“Needs more visibility and programme engagement”
Health or social care provider

“Reliable and capable delivery-focused and knowledge-sharing staff”
Private company
Q. If you have any comments about the AHSN’s staff, leadership and priorities, please type in below [continued from previous page]

Theme(s) identified within the answers provided by specific stakeholder groups include:

**Theme #1: Knowledgeable**

**Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS)**

“The staff are of a very high standard. They deliver projects in amazingly short timescales to very high standards, but at the same time listening to other people and particularly the patients they are trying to help.”

“The HIN is well led and the people that I have interacted with have been not only personable, but knowledgeable and helpful.”

**Local Government**

“The CEO has exceptional strategic and relationship management skills. She is a natural collaborator with real drive and passion to improve the health and care outcomes of Londoners”

**Other**

“The AHSN staff are very helpful and actively encourage and support collaborative working. They are also very proactive in their approach to supporting SMEs and introducing innovative technologies into the NHS.”

“Staff are knowledgeable and collegiate, always happy to share best practice. Leadership is visible and strong, commercially aware.”

**Theme #2: Communication**

**Health or social care provider**

“Communication with members not always effective.”

**Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)**

“Lots of opportunities for expansion of current AHSN programmes, but need more communication with local clinical leads to determine priorities”
Value associated with the level of support provided
Q. The AHSN aims to work with organisations on the following themes. For each theme, how valuable or not has been the support from the AHSN in the last 12 months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>2015 (n=32)</th>
<th>2016 (n=61)</th>
<th>% of those who think that the AHSN has provided valuable support on....</th>
<th>% of those who think that that the AHSN has provided valuable support excluding those answering ‘not received’ and ‘not applicable’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50% 6% 22% 22%</td>
<td>61% 5% 16% 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality improvement (providing support for innovation and new ways of working)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75% 6% 9% 9%</td>
<td>HIN South London: 74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial development</td>
<td>16% 28% 22% 34%</td>
<td>41% 13% 21% 25%</td>
<td>All: 43% HIN South London: 41%</td>
<td>HIN South London 2016: 76% HIN South London 2015: 36% All 2016: 77% All 2015: 68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioning support</td>
<td>38% 16% 25% 22%</td>
<td>44% 7% 20% 30%</td>
<td>All: 35% HIN South London: 44%</td>
<td>HIN South London 2016: 87% HIN South London 2015: 71% All 2016: 76% All 2015: 63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In 2015 phrased as “Quality improvement”
Q. The AHSN aims to work with organisations on the following themes. For each theme, how valuable or not has been the support from the AHSN in the last 12 months? [continued from previous page]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>2015 (n=32)</th>
<th>2016 (n=61)</th>
<th>Net valuable</th>
<th>Net not valuable</th>
<th>Not received support</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification, adoption and spread of innovation</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating collaboration</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing leadership to the local health economy</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of those who think that the AHSN has provided valuable support excluding those answering ‘not received’ and ‘not applicable’

- HIN South London 2015: 77%
- HIN South London 2016: 84%
- All 2015: 79%
- All 2016: 86%

Net valuable = % very valuable + % quite valuable
Preferred methods of communication between AHSN and stakeholders
Q. Which, if any, of the following are or would be your preferred ways for the AHSN to communicate with you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>2016 (%)</th>
<th>2015 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email newsletter</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops, consultations or events</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to one meetings</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations to peer networks</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed newsletters</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 (n=59) vs 2015 (n=32)
Impressions of AHSN performance & effectiveness
Q. Overall, how would you rate the AHSN’s...

Accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Neither good nor poor</th>
<th>Quite poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 (n=32)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=58)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responsiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Neither good nor poor</th>
<th>Quite poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 (n=32)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=58)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality of advice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Neither good nor poor</th>
<th>Quite poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 (n=32)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=58)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Position indicator:
% of those who rate the AHSN as very / quite good for...

- Accessibility:
  - 2015: 41% (HIN South London: 83%)
  - 2016: 33% (HIN South London: 83%)
- Responsiveness:
  - 2015: 34% (HIN South London: 83%)
  - 2016: 26% (HIN South London: 83%)
- Quality of advice:
  - 2015: 31% (HIN South London: 83%)
  - 2016: 34% (HIN South London: 83%)

Net good = % very good + % quite good
Q. Overall, how would you rate the AHSN’s…
[continued from previous page]

Position indicator:
% of those who rate the AHSN as good for...

**Quality of support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Neither good nor poor</th>
<th>Quite poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=58)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (n=32)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Knowledge of the local landscape**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Neither good nor poor</th>
<th>Quite poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=58)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (n=32)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Promoting change in the local health economy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Quite good</th>
<th>Neither good nor poor</th>
<th>Quite poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=58)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (n=32)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q. How effective or ineffective is the AHSN in doing each of the following? *Focusing on the needs of patients and local populations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Net effective</th>
<th>Neither effective nor ineffective</th>
<th>Net ineffective</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=57)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2016 Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (n=32)</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2015 (n=32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net effective = % very effective + % quite effective
Net ineffective = % quite ineffective + % very ineffective

[Graph showing the distribution of responses for 2016 and 2015]
Q. How effective or ineffective is the AHSN in doing each of the following? *Building a culture of partnership and collaboration*

- **2016 Average**
  - Net effective: 71%
  - Net ineffective: 9%
  - Neither effective nor ineffective: 10%
  - Not sure: 10%

- **2015**
  - Net effective: 78%
  - Net ineffective: 6%
  - Neither effective nor ineffective: 9%
  - Not sure: 6%

Net effective = % very effective + % quite effective
Net ineffective = % quite ineffective + % very ineffective
Q. How effective or ineffective is the AHSN in doing each of the following? *Speeding up adoption of innovation into practice*

- **2016 Average**
  - Net effective: 59%
  - Neither effective nor ineffective: 17%
  - Net ineffective: 14%
  - Not sure: 10%

- **2015 (n=32)**
  - Net effective: 63%
  - Neither effective nor ineffective: 6%
  - Net ineffective: 16%
  - Not sure: 16%

- **2016 (n=57)**
  - Net effective: 77%
  - Neither effective nor ineffective: 11%
  - Net ineffective: 16%
  - Not sure: 5%
Q. How effective or ineffective is the AHSN in doing each of the following? **Creating wealth**

- **2016 Average**
  - **Net effective**: 33%
  - **Neither effective nor ineffective**: 38%
  - **Net ineffective**: 19%
  - **Not sure**: 10%

- **2015 (n=32)**
  - **Net effective**: 41%
  - **Neither effective nor ineffective**: 28%
  - **Net ineffective**: 14%
  - **Not sure**: 9%

- **2016 (n=57)**
  - **Net effective**: 35%
  - **Neither effective nor ineffective**: 28%
  - **Net ineffective**: 10%
  - **Not sure**: 19%

---

Net effective = % very effective + % quite effective
Net ineffective = % quite ineffective + % very ineffective
Q. Thinking about the last 12 months to what extent would you agree or disagree that the AHSN has helped you / your organisation achieve your objectives?

Net agree = % strongly agree + % tend to agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 (n=32)</th>
<th>2016 (n=57)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to agree</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015 (n=32) 2016 (n=57)
Q. Has the AHSN achieved more or less than you expected in the last 12 months?

- Much more: 2015 (n=32) - 13%, 2016 (n=57) - 32%
- Somewhat more: 2015 (n=32) - 28%, 2016 (n=57) - 21%
- About what was expected: 2015 (n=32) - 34%, 2016 (n=57) - 30%
- Somewhat less: 2015 (n=32) - 13%, 2016 (n=57) - 4%
- Much less: 2015 (n=32) - 13%, 2016 (n=57) - 2%
- Not sure: 2015 (n=32) - 13%, 2016 (n=57) - 12%

Net more than expected = % much more + % somewhat more
Q. Would you recommend involvement in /working with the AHSN to others?

2016 Average

- Yes: 78%
- No: 6%
- Not sure: 16%

2015 (n=32)

- Yes: 91%
- No: 9%
- Not sure: 9%

2016 (n=57)

- Yes: 86%
- No: 11%
- Not sure: 4%
Q. To help your organisation meet its objectives over the next 5 years, what are the most valuable areas of support AHSNs could offer?

Theme(s) identified within the answers provided by specific stakeholder groups include:

**Theme #1: Sharing Best Practice**

- **Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS)**
  - “Identifying and supporting innovations and best practice”
  - “Fostering collaboration within STPs”

- **Patients Groups**
  - “Demonstrating ways of working more effectively and efficiently to save NHS £s”

- **Health or Social Care Provider**
  - “Improving best practice around patient experience”
  - “identifying innovations and best practice - end of life care/ dementia/ learning disabilities”

- **Other**
  - “spreading a wider range of best practice more”
  - “Identifying innovations and best practice - with respect to glucose monitoring in diabetes”

- **Private Company**
  - “Facilitating better shared innovative culture with the relevant CCGs”
  - “Sharing best practice”
AHSN specific questions
Q. Which Health Innovation Network programmes are you aware of?

- Diabetes: 85%
- Dementia: 54%
- Patient Safety: 48%
- Alcohol: 46%
- Digital Health Accelerator: 46%
- Internship Scheme: 46%
- Musculoskeletal: 44%
- Technology and Information: 35%
- Atrial Fibrillation: 22%
- HIN Change Support: 19%
- None of the above: 2%

2016 (n=54)
If there is one thing Health Innovation Network is known for, what is it?

Theme(s) identified within the answers provided by specific stakeholder groups include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme #1: Facilitating Collaboration</th>
<th>Theme #2: Diabetes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS)</strong></td>
<td>Health or Social Care Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Bringing people together to promote innovation”</td>
<td>“Collaboration / facilitating sharing best practice”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)</strong></td>
<td>Private Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Bring people together to make change happen”</td>
<td>“Connecting people”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Higher Education Institute</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Good networking opportunities at events”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health or Social Care Provider</strong></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“diabetes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“engagement with the CLAHRC and Diabetes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Company</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Diabetes collaborative”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Increasing uptake of insulin pump therapy”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YouGov
How could Health Innovation Network help your organisation more?

Theme(s) identified within the answers provided by specific stakeholder groups include:

**Theme #1: Focus on Collaboration and Partnerships**

**Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS)**
- “partnership work in dealing with alcohol misuse”

**Other**
- “I would like to share our work and help support spread and adoption.”
- “Closer partnership working”

**Health or Social Care Provider**
- “Better comms”

**Local Government**
- “Increase the collaboration with the other London AHSNs to defuse innovation quicker”